Serial Nos. 1 to

Later references. (L. 92.)

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

Serial Nos. 1 to 14.

M ~~Part~~ B for February 1896.

SUBJECT.

Appeal of Nadiga Sivappa of Tavanadi &c. &c. Shanbhoga of Kowkalli village &c. South Canara

Communicated Narayana Rao

WD 2283—GPB—20,000—14-6-20

Precis

S. A. S No. 171 of 90 [illegible]

Appellant: Navinja Linga
of Kerehalli Sorab
Taluk

Respondents:

1 Navinja Lingapp
2 Hanumantha
Rao

&

On the 6th October
1890 the appellant (Plff)
filed a suit before the
Deputy Comr of Shimo
for the recovery of the
Shanbhogi of three out of
six circles, that had fallen
to the share of the 1st Resp
(Deft), in [acceptance gift] the [illegible]
[a Rajeenama executed to him] partition by 2nd Respt father

The case was referred
to the Sorab Amildar
for enquiry & submiss
of record with his find
-ing.

by commissioner
of 27-10-90

The Plff Navinja Linga
applied to the Amildar
for permission to put
in an amended plaint

√

In the amended plaint the Plaintiff sought to recover either the Shan-bhogi of three out of six circles that had fallen to the share of the 1st Defdt or the Shanbhogi of the eight villages of Tavanandi Nagani that had originally fallen to the hands of Nimpia father of the 2nd Defdt.

The Defdts objected to the amended plaint being filed and the Tahildar reported the matter to the Deputy Commr.

21-12-90.

The Deputy Commr referred the case to Mr. H. V. Ranganayya Asst Commr Shimoga for disposal.

12-1-91

The amended plaint was admitted by the Asst Commr.

This plaint states as follows:-

(1) That the Plff & the Defts belong to one and the same family

(3) (2)

(2) That the nadja & Shanbhogi office, of the magances of Tavanandi, Bhonti, Sorab, Nadja & Hecha which belonged to their family had been originally jointly held by the ancestors of the Pltff and the Defts.

(3) That subsequently the nadja & Shanbhogi offices of Tavanandi magani were held by his (Pltf's) father and those of the other magans by the 1st & 2d Defts' ancestors.

(4) That the 1st & the 2d defts had been un-divided and the 2d Defts' father had been the managing member of their family.

(5) That he (Pltf) got the nadja & Shanbhogi offices of Tavanandi magani from his father in 1865

and managed the said
duties till 1869; that
he was dismissed from
the office in 1870, whereafter
they were registered in
the name of his younger
brother Bichtappa and
that at that time the
2nd deft' father Virupia
was unjustly appointed
as gumastha of the said Bichtappa for Kammara
and 7 other villages.
(6) That he appealed to
the Chief Commr against
the order of dismissal
and was thereupon ordered
by the Commr to be restored
to his offices.
(7) That after his restora-
tion he filed a suit
in 1872-73 against Virupia
above named for the
recovery of the Shanbhogi
of the eight villages referred to
when Virupia agreed
to give him the Shan-
bhogi of half the number
of his (Virupia's) villages
in Sorab magani and

to receive in exchange
the Shanbhogi of the
eight villages sued for,
and that the suit was
accordingly compromised.

(8) That as the Shanbhogi
of the magannes Sorab
Anaje & Keche' had been
jointly held by Nadiga
Rungappa, Kaci Kav
and Virupia above
named it was not
possible for him (Plff)
to get the Shanbhogi
according to the above
Agreement.

(9) That at the Pukka
Potgi settlement Virupia
had agreed to give him
the promised Shanbhogi
after a division was
effected between him (Virupa)
and Nadiga Rungappa.

(10) That at the Potgi settle-
ment the pumaettas
that had been nominated
by the huckdars were
confirmed as huckdar Shanbhogies
and on the Plff & Defts
having appealed to Govt

it was ordered that the claims of the original hukoars should not be interfered with and the ~~arbitrators~~ exception ~~with this order~~ the Shanbhogi of Totina Aadige, yelavalli, Kalisunsi Devathe koppa & Mavali came to the Defts share of the portion which Pungappa, Kari Kari and Defts above named effected amongst themselves.

(4) That he asked the Defts to give him three out of the above six circles according to the above Rayasama, and they objected on 9th July 1890 to give the same.

The 1st Defts Lingappa filed the following written statement:- 12-2-91

(1) That the Tavanandi Nagani belongs both to the Plff and Defts and the other four maganes above referred to do not at all belong to Plff.

(2) That the 1st Dept & the father of the 2d Dept were undivided although the former had been during his minority living with the latter

(3) That the entire hak to the nadiga & Shanbhogi

7 V/

Office of Tavanandi
Nagani did not pass
to Plff from his father
Nimpalkhappa.

(4) That until 1869 the
Shanbhogi of the 89
villages of Tavanandi
Nagani was jointly held
by Plaintiff, his father
and the 2d Defts' father
and that afterwards
the villages were divided
between Plff's father
and the 2d Defts' father
since it was found in-
convenient to hold the
office jointly.

(5) That according to
the Chief Comm's order,
Plff was restored only
to the Nadiga office.

(6) That there was
no agreement between
Plff and the 2d Defts'
father as stated in the
plaint and that the
Suit was dismissed for
default of Plff's appearance
in 1872-73

(7) That it is false that
2d Defts' father agreed

8

at the Potgi settlement
to give his villages after
a division was effected
between him and Nadiga
Rungappa.

(8) That the defts have
been for nearly 50 years
in the enjoyment of the (Shanbhogi)
office of all the other
Mogans excepting
Jawanadi.

(9) That Plff cannot
again sue for the ~~office~~
Shanbhogi of Jawanadi;
since he had formerly
sued for the same and
the case had been then
dismissed.

(* in 1872-73)

The 1st Deft further
stated that it was true
that the Mogani Shan
bhogi had been registered
in the name of Plff or
his brother Richtappa
till the Pukka Potgi
settlement, although
the duties thereof were
performed by others
and that although he (1st Deft)
and the 2d Deft's father had been

(vide next Counsel's notes in Reference)

divided he lived during his minority with the 2d Defts father since he had lost his parents and that a division had been effected between him and the 2d Defts four years ago as their properties had been mixed up and a portion of his (1st defts) property had been also wasted during his minority by the 2d defts father.

The 2d Defts stated he had nothing more to add to the 1st defts statement.

Mr M. V. Ananjendrappa counsel for the pltff framed the following issues:-

(1) Will the Pltff be entitled to the Share of the village expenses in the plaint because the karanam stood in his name till the Pukka Patta Settlement?

10

(2) Was Virupia competent to represent the 1st Deft
~~to bind the 1st Deft~~
to act as he did in the interest of Singappa when he signed
in the U.S of 1872-73?

(3) Is it true that
Virupia entered into
an agreement with
Plff and compromised
the suit?

(4) Does the order
dismissing the above
suit for default of
appearance operate
as a bar to the present
suit?

(5) Is the present suit
barred by limitation.

(6) Is the Plff entitled
to the relief he claims?

Kadappa and Plff
Siddappa were examined
as witnesses for Plaintiff
and exhibits A to J
were filed.

The 1st Deft Singappa
was examined as a
witness for Deft & Exhibits
I to III were filed.

The Asst Commr
in his judgment dated

the 20th July 1870 states

" The Defts have admitted that the Shanbhogi hakdaru of Javanadi Nagani stood in the name of Plff until the Putkapotgi Settlement took place. Only for a short time in the interval the hakdaru stood in the name of his younger brother Bikkappa. Plff appealed to the Chief Court against the order of dismissal passed by the Deputy Supt. The hakdaru who thereupon (in 1870) registered again in his name. It is clear from the records that Pijji Swappa alone was looking after the duties of Javanadi Nagani during the Survey operations in 1868-69. He was dismissed from the

12

office only because
he was unable to manage
the duties of so many
villages. The villages were
then distributed as
follows; 12 villages to
Bichtappa plaintiffs
younger brother who
was the karaimadar,
the eight villages in dispute
were given to ~~the~~ 2nd defts
father (Virupa) and
the remaining villages
to another kinsman
Puttu Saiva. The Chief
Commrs order simply
directs that the 12 villages
which had been assigned
to Bichtappa should
be allotted to the charge
of Siraffa, so that the
Plff has not been in
-ment of the office of
these eight villages since
1870. ~~Plff~~ Pff of Plaintiff now sues
~~to recover~~ to recover
these eight villages the
suit is clearly barred

* Exhibit III
of 22.8.71

by limitation

Plff seems to have anticipated this objection and has accordingly based his suit on the Pageenama executed by his late father in 1873. For the 23rd Sept: 1872 Plff filed a suit against the 2d defts' father & Puttusamia for the recovery of the Shanbhogi of the 15 villages of the Nagamangalam that had been given for their share. The 1st Deft was not then made a party to the suit, nor was Virupia father of 2d deft sued as the managing member and representative of the family of which he & the 1st deft were said to have been undivided members. That suit should therefore be considered to have been filed against Virupia alone.

14

On the 30th October 1873 Plaintiff and Virapia produced a Kayeenama. This Kayee-nama was sent by the Amildar to the Sup^{t}. The suit was there regularly taken on the file and an order passed that the case should be heard on the 25th March 1874. No decree was given according to the Kayee-nama.

If the Kayeenama was an independent contract it should have been executed on proper stamp & should probably have been registered.

~~Pltff had obtained~~ Besides Pltff had sought to recover in that suit the Shanbhogi of Villages other than those which had been restored to him by the Chief Comm^{rs} order refd to above for which he could have no claim whatever.

|| Note
On 8.4.74 Captain Anderson Asst C.C Shimoga dismissed the suit for default of Pltff appearance (vide order in the Civil record)

This fact seems to have escaped notice of the settlement officer at the Pargana where is another pleader in the case. Even the parties to the Rajeenama do not seem to have looked upon it as an independent and binding contract. The Plaintiff never made any mention of the Rajeenama at the time of the Pargi settlement. On the other hand he urged his claims to the Zamindari Pargana instead of to the Village agreed to be given to him according to the Rajeenama. Under these circumstances the suit is dismissed with costs."

Plaintiff-Respondent appealed to the Deputy Commr against the above order on the following grounds:-

(1) That the lower Court

erred in law in holding that the suit is barred by limitation.

(2) That the lower Court erred also in finding that exhibit B[x] required registration and stamp.

(3) That the admitted and proved facts of the case show beyond doubt that the Pltf is the rightful owner of the subject matter of the suit

(4) That the judgment of the lower Court is based on presumptions not warranted by the facts of the case.

On appeal Mr Abdal Rahman a Deputy Commr passed the following order:

[x] Reg receipt referred to above

24.9.91

x x

"Appellant took the shambhagi of the eight villages he now seeks to recover from the Respondents finally in 1875 when he was restored to office

under the orders of the
Chief Commissioner
with the charge of only
twelve villages out of a
total of 30 villages. One
Nimpia × section of the
appellant finally obtained
the eight villages in dispute
at the same time.

(2nd Koopti Section)

In 1872 appellant sued
Nimpia and Puttasamia
who had obtained the
remaining villages under
the above orders but
allowed the suit to be
dismissed for default.
Appellant ~~brought~~ failed at the
Pukka Potti settlement
in 1878-79 when the eight
villages in dispute were
given to the 2nd Koopti
(Nimpia's son) at Nimpia's
~~death~~ instance.

After the issue of Govt
Resp of 1884 the Koopti
who are continue divided
the eight villages between
them and hold them
still as two circles each.

× ×
Though admittedly appt
received the 1/5 share of

5238-46
Ci 183
96-12-87
vide Shimoga Dy
Comm's order of
29-12-87 in Kannada
(vide Ver. records in
the case)

the Sangani Chambhaj till the Polja settlement in 1879, it is evident that Pimpla was made an independent Shan bhaj and not a pimashka in 1871 for he was no outrider but a huckbar and a Cashalee himself and treated as such at the Polja settlement also. Appellant was evidently on that ground referred × to a civil court in which he recorked in 1872 and failed on account of his default. × ×

Appellant having first put his case in 1869 then in 1871 and then in a regular suit filed in a competent court in 1874† he is clearly barred from reopening the dispute. His suit instituted on 8th Oct. last was rightly held by lower Court as time barred computing the time even from 1874.

The Polja settlement Officer order placed

vide Polja Rep.t of 1878-79

× vide order of 5.10.71 of Diwan Gopi Nagar in Kannada

† vide Captain Anderson's order referred to above)

against the appellant by the Asst Commr x x in 1879 was confirmed by the Deputy Commr in 1883 under article 12 of the Circulars the appellant was allowed only a years time to set the order aside. He slept over his time also.

x x

The suit of 1872 was between the appellant on one side and Virupa & Puttawwa on the other side. The present Respondents were no parties to that suit. The effect of the Kaylee-nama filed by Virupa in that suit (Exh C) was lost by the fault of the appellant himself x It is sufficient to state that the Kayleenama is not binding on either the 1st or the 2d Respts.

The decision of the Lower Court must therefore be upheld and the appeal dismissed with costs."

qp

The appellant Narayya Sreeappa now prefers a second appeal to Govt against the above order of the Deputy Commr on the following grounds:- 4-1-92

(1) That his suit is not barred by limitation

(2) That his suit was not lost simply because others were doing the Shanbhogi work for him.

(3) That the judgments of the lower Courts are opposed to each other.

(4) That an order was passed in 1890 that the case could not be decided summarily, and that in accordance with it he filed the regular suit. vide annexure dated 30.7.90

The appellant prays that as the case is not barred by limitation it may be remanded to the lower Court and his suit ordered to be decreed.

MCM

Translation of Exhibit P is appended

Translation of Exhibit B filed in Revenue Suit No 1 of 1890-91 on the file of the 1st Asst Commr Shimoga:

In the Sorab Taluk Revenue Court

Plff: Javanandi Sivappa

Defts: 1 Nadiga Vinpia

2 Puttusamia

The "Kabuli" (agreement) dated 30-10-73 presented by the 1st Deft:—

In the matter of a suit filed against me by Plff for the recovery of the village Shanbhogi huk, Plff and myself have effected a compromise between ourselves since we belong to one and the same family. The particulars

of the compromise are as follows :.

I myself should continue to look after the Shan - bhogi duties as hereto - fore of the villages of Tavanandi magani, in respect of which Pliff has now sued. In ex - change for this, Sivappa (Pliff) shall get half the number of villages that are at present in my charge and are attach - ed to the Sirab magani nadigaship which belongs to me; the other half of the said villages shall go to my share. In this manner we have divided the Shanbhogi of the villages between ourselves. The names should be entered accordingly and the Pliff's suit struck off.

Since we have agreed

between ourselves that both of us should have the 2d Dept and divide between us equally the villages we may recover from him, orders should be passed to treat me also as Dfft.

As my younger bro the[illegible] Son Lingappa is a young boy and as he and I are living together I myself have undertaken the responsibility and have (as above) made over the Sirab "Nagani Varavard" Further, the "Varavard" of Saranavi Nagani which till now stood in the name of Sivappa should be his only and the "Varavard" of the Sirab & the Chowki Nagances Shall remain as heretofore in the names of the persons concerned. Our mutual agreement

is that I should not
ask for the Varavari
of Talavandi Magani
and Siraffa should
not ask for that of the
Sorab & the Chowki
Miganies. We have
effected a division (of
the Villages) as above
for the conduct of duties.
For this reason, I beg
that the Villages of Tava
-vandi Magani may
hereafter be registered
in my name, the Village
of Sorab Magani that
shall pass to Plff from
my Kirdee may be
registered in Plff's name
and the Villages, if any,
that he may hereafter
recover from the 2d
Deft may be registered
in the manner in which
the division has been
effected.

Sd/ Nadiga Timpia
Witnesses

Sd/ Thimmikappa Patel
Mariappa Gowda

Sd/ Bommenhalli Patel
Basa dingappa Gouda

I Thammanagouda
Siddappa agree to act
according to the above
arrangement

Sd/ Nanja Siddappa.

Wits

Sd/ Bommenhalli
Patel Basa dingappa
Gouda

Sd/ Thumikoppa
Patel Nanjaiappa Gouda

'Copy'

BCH

(5)

M 171 of 1891-92

Appt

Nandi Sivappa
of Kerkalli
Sorab Taluq
Shimoga Dt.
Represented by Mr Ramachandra Iyer
advocate

Respt

1 Lingappa
2 Hanumantarao
cousin of no 1
Represented by Mr
Ramaseshaiengar Iyer
advocate

In 1872-73 appt brought a suit against the father of the 2d Respt for thandhoge right in 5 villages of Javanandi Magani. While the suit was in progress, the father of the 2d Respt & apptt entered into a Razinamah in October 1873, in which 2d Respts father agreed to give apptt half the number of the villages in Sorab in lieu of the villages in Javanandi Magani, claimed by the Razinamah was filed before the Amildar, but when the papers came before the Dy Collr he fixed a date for

2] a hearing & dismissed the
in April 1874.
Suit as the parties failed to
appear. — No Razenamah
decree was passed. —

In 1890-91, a fresh suit was brought
by present suit & prays that certain
villages in Sorab, or there in
Jawanadi might be decreed to
the asst Coll who heard the case
dismissed the suit on the ground that the
Razenamah of 1873 was not
accepted by the Judge, & that it
could not be looked upon as an
independent document since it
was neither stamped nor registered. —
The asst Coll evidently thought
that the article of Limitation for the
Villages in the Jawanadi Inaam
was barred by lapse of time, but
recorded no distinct finding
on the point. The Dy Coll
when the appeal was
preferred observed that appl

(X) There is apparently a distinction between the Inquisitorial Authority and the Ecclesiastical Authority — An Inquisitorial Authority the Apostolical Nuncio the Pope attached to that office as Nuncio, but if he did not pay any Emolument — a Jurisdiction which appertained separately to the Crown in Ecclesiastical Causes as regards the Exhibited Articles was in dispute, the mere fact, that the Inquisitorial Authority was drawn & exhibited to 1879, cannot, (it may be argued) as removing the bar of limitation in respect of the Ecclesiastical Authority of the Crown a Ecclesiastical Authority — this point however was not considered Either by Court —

1. Stamp sufficient.

2. Copy of order [illegible] -ded.

3. Appeal in time.

4. Case under Clause 1. Rule 1 of the Council Rules.

L.R. 1892-91-1

Submitted to the Council.

Jwk 3/2/92

H
3/2/92

A -
L -
R.

Adv
4/2/92

(General Serial No. 32.)

189[illegible].

No. 25-11

Name of Petitioner. Nadig Sivappa (Unsuccessful - Appellant (Plf

Village. Kérékalli

Taluk. Sorab

District. Shemoga

Date of Arzi. 4th January 1892

Date of Receipt. 4th January 1892

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. 2

ABSTRACT.

(Respondent (1) Nadiglingaj
(2) Hanmanth
(Defts)

Petitioner Sivappa appea
against the judgment of the
Deputy Commr of the Shemo
District in Revenue Appe a
No. 3 of 1891-92, on the following
grounds.

1. That he has been the
Registered Patel and enjoy
of the villages referred to in
the judgment as per late
Chief Commrs order.

2. That the appellant is ab
wrongfully kept out of
others were doing the work
for him & during the Patel a
Patel's Settlement they were
ordered to continue.

3. That the lower Court

dgments appeared as they
to each other, are contrary
law & justice.

That, as petitioner has
ever petitioning the various
fficers from the Amildar
wards from 1870 to 1890,
etitioner's Suit cannot
gally be considered to
ave been barred by limi-
ation, especially when he
rought a regular Suit
mmediately on being
directed by the Amildar
in 1890 to ~~bring a regular Suit~~ do so. M

Petitioner therefore begs
hat the case may be
remanded to the Lower
Court, and his hak re-
stored to him.

(Srinivasingar.)

M
3/2/92

32

4-1-92

5-1-92

4-1-92

4-1-92

Ten Rupees Stamp affixed.

Appeal No: 171 of 9'-92.

(1)

Advocate

No. 65 K.

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 251 dated 4th January 1892 received at the Dewan's Office from Venkoji Krishna Rao Krishna Rao Saheb, of Kerehalli, Doral Taluk,

L. R. 122-91-2

is forwarded, together with its two enclosures, to the Deputy Commissioner Shimoga District for submission of Proceedings and the records thereof.

By Order,

Drafted as per Commissioner's order

BANGALORE, 6th February 1892.

Chief Secretary.

(General Serial No. 30.)

1892. No. 1291

From The Agent [illegible]
Kamloops District

To The Chief Secretary to the Govt of Lieut-Gov

Dated 14th December 92

Despatched

Received

L.R. 122-91-3

Enclosures No.

1 Translation
2 Copy of letter
3 Judgment
4 Petition
5 Warrant

General No.
No.

With reference to the Petition of [illegible] dated the 4th Dec. 92 praying for the release of [illegible] from the Kamloops Gaol, I have the honor to forward herewith a Petition addressed to His Excellency the Lieut-Governor in Council with the Papers connected therewith.

Peter Branch
Agent
16/12

CP
21/12/92

9 Remainders
Dec 14 1892 - mailed 12-8-92
" 50
Dec 6 1892 - 12-8-92
6
[illegible]

17/12/92

1892-93 71

Re The Deputy Commissioner
Nimach Cantonment

In the Chief Secretary to the Govt
of Rajputana

Dated 14th December 93

No 9073
864

His Official Memo dt 4th
Sept 93 forwarding Petition
from Lady Cradock & Sergeant
Neal for Grant of Pension &
Gratuities &c &c &c

I have to refer to the above
letter regarding the
Proceedings connected with the
case —

2. The Petition with the accompanying
papers is herewith returned —

I have &c &c &c
Deputy Commissioner

Before the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja
of Mysore. (6)

Appeal No 171 of 1893-94.

Appellant
Kadig Sivappa
of Herehalli,
Sorab Taluk,
Shimoga District,
represented by M. Srinivasa
Iyengar, advocate

Respondents
1. Lingappa
2 Hanumanta
Bar, owning
No 1
represented by
M. Ramaswamy
Iyer, advocate.

Decision dated 10-2-94

L.R. 22-91-4

In 1872-73, appellant brought a suit against the father of the 2d Respondent for Chambhagi right in 3 villages of Javanandi nagani. While the suit was in progress, the fathers of the 2d Respondent and Appellant entered into a Razinamah in October 1873, in which 2d Respondent's father agreed to give appellant half the number of his villages in Sorab in lieu of the villages in Javanandi nagani, then claimed. His Razinamah

was filed before the Amildar, but when the papers came before the Deputy Superintendent, he fixed a date for a hearing, and dismissed the suit in April 1874, as the parties failed to appear. The Razinamah dated was passed

2. In 1880-81, Appellant brought the present suit and prayed that either the villages in Sorab, or those in Savanur might be decreed to him. The Assistant Commissioner who heard the case dismissed the suit on the ground that the Razinamah of 1873 was not accepted by the Judge, and that it could not be looked upon as an independent Document, since it was neither stamped nor registered. The Assistant Commissioner evidently thought that

appellant's claim for the villages in the Jawandi Razinama was barred by lapse of time, but, recorded no distinct finding on the point. The Deputy Commissioner to whom an appeal was preferred, observed that appellant lost his right to the Jawandi villages in 1871, and that he can have no right to the villages in Sorab on the ground of the Razinama, as no decree was passed on it, and accordingly dismissed the suit. The present appeal is against this decree.

3. So far as the claim to the villages in Sorab is concerned, the suit has been properly dismissed, as the Razinama on which the claim is based cannot matter be regarded as a

independent document
or as a part of the decree of
1874. but as regards the
claim to the Zaramandi
villages [illegible], the
deputy Commissioner
remarks that "admittedly
appellant received the total
pay of the Inagani Chanbhag
till the Sotegi settlement
in 1877", but he does not
explain why the cause of
action should not be
reckoned in regard to the
Zaramandi villages from 1877,
in which case the suit
cannot be said to be barred
by lapse of time. There is
apparently a distinction
between the Inagani Chanbhag
and the village Chanbhag.
As Inagani Chanbhag,
the appellant apparently

× now
bill are
used -
or or not
to!
×

appears in the Accounts the pay attached to that office, viz, Rs 3-- a year whereas, but if he did not enjoy any emoluments or perquisites which appertained separately to the gramas or village Chambery as regards the eight villages now in dispute, the mere fact, that the magani pay was drawn by appellant up to 1879, could not, it may be argued, be taken advantage of as removing the bar by limitation in respect of the half appertaining to the gramas or village Chambery. This point, however, was not considered by the Deputy Commr. The case will, therefore, be remanded to the Deputy Commr

to record a distinct view on the front, and if the result of the enquiry is that the suit is not barred, to pass a decision on the merits of the case

'By Order'

Asst to Chief Secretary

No. 14219
Pol. 7 19-93
Copy to the Dy. Commr. Shimoga with the ver: prop received with his No. 903/864 of 14-12-92

'By Order'

Asst to Chief Secretary

No. 2511
as 171

27-2-94

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT,

L.R. 122-91-5

17th Feby 1894

Endorsement granted to Reading Inspector of Kunduli Sub-District, Shimoga District

in reply to his Petition Registered No. 2511 as 171 dated 4th January 1894 appealing against the decision of the Deputy Commr of Shimoga in Rev. appeal Nos 3 of 1891-92 regarding the Mamboge of certain villages in Tarikere Taluk

Petitioner is informed that the case has been remanded for further enquiry and

2 the case are returned

15/2/94

By order

15/2

Chief Secretary

Rs 14-2-0 27-2-94

Pet-7-93-94.26.

Copy forwarded to the Commissioner for Enquiry and Report

"By Order"

Chief Secretary.

Mysore Govt. Central Press, Bangalore.—9-2-93—2000.

No 1210

neral Serial No. 32.)

1894.

Camp Rolls 164

Name of Petitioner. Sirappa & Nanjaya

Village. Lakkundi

Taluk. Gadag

District. Dharwar

Date of Arzi. 19-10-94

Date of Receipt. 19-10-94

Date of Disposal. 10/12 Stamp office.

No. of Enclosures. five

Appeal against decision in a Deputy Suit

Stamp office

In time.

1. Proceedings of the Collector, &c

2. Do of Deputy Commissioner

(2) nos 14/11

Work 15/11

L.R. 122-91-6

ABSTRACT.

Appeals against the decision, in 2nd July 1894, of the Deputy Comm. Shimoga district, in Revenue Appe 3 of 1891-92, confirming his origina decision of the 24th September 1891 in the emoluments of the Shanbhogie offi of the 8 villages of the Lakkundi her

Register
Council case
Stamp

Jewellers stamp
affix

12/11/94

1210 ₹

10.10.94

[illegible]

1 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

2 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

3 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

ਮੈਂ ਤਰਲੋਚਨ ਸਿੰਘ ਦੇ ਦਸਖ਼ਤ

ਹਲਫ਼ਨਾਮਾ ਮੁਕੱਦਮਾ ਨੰਬਰ ਮਜਰੂਹ ਮਿਸਲ ਮਾਲਕੀ ਜ਼ਮੀਨ ਮੌਜ਼ਾ ਰਾਮਪੁਰ ਖੁਰਦ

ਮੈਂ ਤਰਲੋਚਨ ਸਿੰਘ ਪੁੱਤਰ ਸ. ਹਰਨਾਮ ਸਿੰਘ ਜੱਟ ਸਿੱਖ ਉਮਰ ੫੮ ਸਾਲ ਵਾਸੀ ਰਾਮਪੁਰ ਖੁਰਦ ਤਹਿਸੀਲ ਨਾਭਾ ਜ਼ਿਲ੍ਹਾ ਪਟਿਆਲਾ ਹਲਫ਼ ਉਠਾ ਕੇ ਬਿਆਨ ਕਰਦਾ ਹਾਂ ਕਿ ਮੈਂ ਮੌਜ਼ਾ ਰਾਮਪੁਰ ਖੁਰਦ ਦੀ ਜ਼ਮੀਨ ਦਾ ਮਾਲਕ ਹਾਂ ਅਤੇ ਖੇਤੀਬਾੜੀ ਦਾ ਕੰਮ ਕਰਦਾ ਹਾਂ। ਮੇਰੇ ਕੋਲ ਕੁੱਲ ਰਕਬਾ ੧੪ ਕਨਾਲ ੬ ਮਰਲੇ ਹੈ ਜੋ ਮੈਂ ਸਾਲ ੧੯੯੧ ਵਿੱਚ ਖ਼ਰੀਦਿਆ ਸੀ। ਇਸ ਜ਼ਮੀਨ ਦੀ ਰਜਿਸਟਰੀ ਮੇਰੇ ਕੋਲ ਮੌਜੂਦ ਹੈ ਅਤੇ ਇੰਤਕਾਲ ਨੰਬਰ ੪੭੨ ਵੀ ਦਰਜ ਹੈ।

ਮੈਂ ਇਹ ਵੀ ਬਿਆਨ ਕਰਦਾ ਹਾਂ ਕਿ ਸਾਡੇ ਪਿੰਡ ਦੇ ਕੁਝ ਲੋਕਾਂ ਨੇ ਮੇਰੀ ਜ਼ਮੀਨ ਦੇ ਰਸਤੇ ਵਿੱਚ ਰੁਕਾਵਟ ਪਾਉਣੀ ਸ਼ੁਰੂ ਕਰ ਦਿੱਤੀ ਹੈ। ਉਹ ਮੇਰੇ ਖੇਤ ਵਿੱਚ ਜਾਣ ਵਾਲੇ ਰਸਤੇ ਉੱਤੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਟਰੈਕਟਰ ਖੜ੍ਹੇ ਕਰ ਦਿੰਦੇ ਹਨ ਅਤੇ ਕਹਿੰਦੇ ਹਨ ਕਿ ਇਹ ਰਸਤਾ ਸਾਡਾ ਹੈ। ਇਸ ਕਾਰਨ ਮੈਨੂੰ ਖੇਤ ਵਿੱਚ ਜਾਣ ਵਿੱਚ ਬਹੁਤ ਮੁਸ਼ਕਲ ਆ ਰਹੀ ਹੈ।

ਮੈਂ ਇਹ ਵੀ ਬਿਆਨ ਕਰਦਾ ਹਾਂ ਕਿ ਇਸ ਸਬੰਧੀ ਮੈਂ ਪਹਿਲਾਂ ਵੀ ਦੋ ਵਾਰ ਪੰਚਾਇਤ ਨੂੰ ਲਿਖਤੀ ਦਰਖ਼ਾਸਤ ਦਿੱਤੀ ਸੀ ਪਰ ਕੋਈ ਕਾਰਵਾਈ ਨਹੀਂ ਹੋਈ। ਹੁਣ ਮੈਂ ਮਜਬੂਰ ਹੋ ਕੇ ਅਦਾਲਤ ਦੀ ਸ਼ਰਨ ਲਈ ਹੈ।

ਮੈਂ ਇਹ ਵੀ ਬਿਆਨ ਕਰਦਾ ਹਾਂ ਕਿ ਮੈਂ ਕਿਸੇ ਦੇ ਖ਼ਿਲਾਫ਼ ਝੂਠਾ ਮੁਕੱਦਮਾ ਨਹੀਂ ਕਰ ਰਿਹਾ ਅਤੇ ਜੋ ਕੁਝ ਲਿਖਿਆ ਹੈ ਸੱਚ ਲਿਖਿਆ ਹੈ।

ਮੈਂ ਇਹ ਵੀ ਬਿਆਨ ਕਰਦਾ ਹਾਂ ਕਿ ਮੇਰੇ ਕੋਲ ਜ਼ਮੀਨ ਦੇ ਕਾਗ਼ਜ਼ਾਤ ਮੌਜੂਦ ਹਨ ਜੋ ਮੈਂ ਅਦਾਲਤ ਵਿੱਚ ਪੇਸ਼ ਕਰਾਂਗਾ।

ਮੈਂ ਇਹ ਵੀ ਬਿਆਨ ਕਰਦਾ ਹਾਂ ਕਿ ਮੇਰੇ ਗਵਾਹ ਮੇਰੇ ਨਾਲ ਹੀ ਪੇਸ਼ ਹੋਣਗੇ।

ਮੈਂ ਇਹ ਵੀ ਬਿਆਨ ਕਰਦਾ ਹਾਂ ਕਿ ਮੈਂ ਕੋਈ ਗੱਲ ਨਹੀਂ ਲੁਕਾਈ ਅਤੇ ਨਾ ਹੀ ਕੋਈ ਗੱਲ ਵਧਾ ਕੇ ਲਿਖੀ ਹੈ।

ਮੈਂ ਇਹ ਵੀ ਬਿਆਨ ਕਰਦਾ ਹਾਂ ਕਿ ਮੈਂ ਇਸ ਮੁਕੱਦਮੇ ਦੀ ਪੈਰਵੀ ਖ਼ੁਦ ਕਰਾਂਗਾ ਅਤੇ ਕਿਸੇ ਵਕੀਲ ਨੂੰ ਵਕਾਲਤਨਾਮਾ ਨਹੀਂ ਦੇਵਾਂਗਾ।

ਮੈਂ ਇਹ ਵੀ ਬਿਆਨ ਕਰਦਾ ਹਾਂ ਕਿ ਮੈਂ ਇਸ ਹਲਫ਼ਨਾਮੇ ਦੀ ਇੱਕ ਨਕਲ ਆਪਣੇ ਕੋਲ ਰੱਖ ਲਈ ਹੈ।

ਮੈਂ ਇਹ ਵੀ ਬਿਆਨ ਕਰਦਾ ਹਾਂ ਕਿ ਮੈਂ ਇਸ ਹਲਫ਼ਨਾਮੇ ਉੱਤੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਦਸਤਖ਼ਤ ਕੀਤੇ ਹਨ।

ਮੈਂ ਇਹ ਵੀ ਬਿਆਨ ਕਰਦਾ ਹਾਂ ਕਿ ਮੈਂ ਇਸ ਹਲਫ਼ਨਾਮੇ ਨੂੰ ਪੜ੍ਹ ਕੇ ਸੁਣਾਇਆ ਗਿਆ ਹੈ।

ਮੈਂ ਇਹ ਵੀ ਬਿਆਨ ਕਰਦਾ ਹਾਂ ਕਿ ਮੈਂ ਇਸ ਹਲਫ਼ਨਾਮੇ ਨੂੰ ਸਮਝ ਲਿਆ ਹੈ।

ਮੈਂ ਇਹ ਵੀ ਬਿਆਨ ਕਰਦਾ ਹਾਂ ਕਿ ਮੈਂ ਇਸ ਹਲਫ਼ਨਾਮੇ ਨੂੰ ਸਹੀ ਮੰਨਦਾ ਹਾਂ।

ਮੈਂ ਇਹ ਵੀ ਬਿਆਨ ਕਰਦਾ ਹਾਂ ਕਿ ਮੈਂ ਇਸ ਹਲਫ਼ਨਾਮੇ ਉੱਤੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਦਸਤਖ਼ਤ ਕੀਤੇ ਹਨ।

ਮੈਂ ਇਹ ਵੀ ਬਿਆਨ ਕਰਦਾ ਹਾਂ ਕਿ ਮੈਂ ਇਸ ਹਲਫ਼ਨਾਮੇ ਨੂੰ ਪੜ੍ਹ ਕੇ ਸੁਣਾਇਆ ਗਿਆ ਹੈ।

ਮੈਂ ਇਹ ਵੀ ਬਿਆਨ ਕਰਦਾ ਹਾਂ ਕਿ ਮੈਂ ਇਸ ਹਲਫ਼ਨਾਮੇ ਨੂੰ ਸਮਝ ਲਿਆ ਹੈ।

ਮੈਂ ਇਹ ਵੀ ਬਿਆਨ ਕਰਦਾ ਹਾਂ ਕਿ ਮੈਂ ਇਸ ਹਲਫ਼ਨਾਮੇ ਨੂੰ ਸਹੀ ਮੰਨਦਾ ਹਾਂ।

ਮੈਂ ਇਹ ਵੀ ਬਿਆਨ ਕਰਦਾ ਹਾਂ ਕਿ ਮੈਂ ਇਸ ਹਲਫ਼ਨਾਮੇ ਉੱਤੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਦਸਤਖ਼ਤ ਕੀਤੇ ਹਨ।

Lal
733

2/7/94

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

10

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. C 164/1210

dated 1st Jan 1894 received at the

Dewan's Office from Chanji Shivappa of

Saraswati, Sowkar Petition appealing

against the order of the Deputy Comr

dated 2nd May 894 in Appeal No 3 of 93-2

regarding ~~the~~ Chandrappa Jain Saraswati Nagara

is forwarded, together with its 5

enclosures, to the Deputy Commissioner

Shimoga direct for submission of

the Index Proceedings relating to the

case

The petition and its enclosures

should be returned

L.R. 122-91-7

By Order,

Bangalore,
15-11- 1894

Chief Secretary.

15/11

15/11

M.G.C.P.Bangalore.—3-5-94.—1,000.

Gen. Serial No. 31.]

189 4 6934

Pet: 309

From The Deputy Commissioner Shimoga 2nd

To Chief (11)

The Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

Dated 27th November

Despatched

Received

Enclosures—No. 5 (with record)

General No. 456 Sending in

No. 354 regarding

With reference to official Memorandum No. Pet: 733 dated 15th instant returning the Petition with enclosures from Madiga Lingappa of Tavandi, Sorab Taluk and forwards the entire Srs: relating to the case.

To be placed in the file and Secretary called for.

Dy Sec/11

Posted to 14 Nov. Cause letter to date for 12/16/2

Papers to 8th June. Notice to issue 12/14/5

L.R. 122-91-8

1893 1894

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Shimoga District

To

The Chief Secretary to the
Dewan of Mysore

Dated 27th }
Recd } November

No. 456/354 Encl: 5 with record
sent by regd. post

His official memorandum
Cir. No. Rct. 733 dated 15th instant
forwarding a petition with
5 enclosures from Madiq
Siriappa of Tavanandi,
Sorab Taluk, appealing
against the order of the
Deputy Commissioner in
Revenue Appeal Cir. No. 37
1891-92, for submission

of Proceedings relating
to the case -

..

In returning the
enclosures of the above,
I am the honor to forward
the entire Proceedings in
Revenue Appeal No 3 of
1891-92 on the file of this
Court together with the
Records in Ref. No 1 of
1891-92 on the file of the
1st Assistant Commissioner's
Court, Shimoga District, as
per Zeruth attached.

I have the honor
For Deputy Commr
Shimoga

Urgent

To

The Dy Commr (12)

Shimoga

Rc 1357/8 26th March 95

26.

As the records

L.R. 122-91-9 Connected with the

appeal preferred by

Nadig Linga

Regarding the Shanbhag

Jawanadi Inam land in

the Dy Commrs Office

No 354 dated 27 March 94

& now been forwarded

to this office as the

settlement Officer has

the powers & regret

that he will not be

good as to send

for them in his office

and to transmit

Kindly return by
post, as the appeal
stands posted to
2 April next for
hearing.

The records
returned by this office
with No 10322/992 dated 14th Dec 94.
may kindly be
of help in enabling
him to trace the
records.

By order
Dy Supdt 26/3/95
Off Clerk

26/3

Gen. Serial No. 31.]

1895 — 12793

R 526 (13)

From The Deputy Commissioner Chitaldroog

To Chief Secretary to the Government of Mysore.

Dated 26th Decr.

Despatched

Received

Enclosures—No.

General No. 681

No. 681

With reference to his Confl. Dis. Pet. No. 1357 dated 26th Instant states that the records in the Chitaldroog case referred to have been forwarded with this office Dis. No. 456/354 dated 27th November last.

Pet 1/4/95

65 1895

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Shimoga District

To The Chief Secretary to the
Government of Mysore

Dated 28th
Weds. } March.

No. 881
681

Chief Secretary's Docket
No. Pet: 1757 dated 26th Instant
regarding the records
exist the Shanbhogi
of Tavarandi magani.

With reference to the
above has the honor to
state that the records in
the Shanbhogi case re-
-ferred to in the above
have been forwarded

with their Office Marking - 1/56
- 354
dated 27th December last
as a registered article - No 568
dated 28th idem.

2. The records referred
to in the Chief Secretary's
Nos 12322 dated 11th December
- 8 792
1891 are now connected
with the Thumbhoge of
Nejamedi in the Sanah
Taluk and these have been
returned to the Sub Divisional
Officer, Sagar, in January
last, & reference has
been made to that Officer
to return with those records
to this Office any returns
such, and on receipt of
them, the records will be
examined and if the

(60)

missing records are found, they will be immediately forwarded.

Yours &c

For Brig Gen Comm
Chickamauga Ga

J E W

A. N. 63 of 1894-95

Appellant

Nadgi Annapa (Civil Plff)

vs

Respts

1 Lingappa

2 Hanmanth Rao (Civil Defts)

L.R. 122-91-11

Enc: 5 Ver: files.

Court Record.

No. of Court Folio,

Proceedings of the Court of Alleppee

(14)

Read:-

Petition No. 1210/63 of 1894-95 presented by Nadig Annapa of Inamandi Sorab Taluk, against the Judgment of the Deputy Commissioner Sirsiyga District dated the 22 July 1894 dismissing the Plaintiffs suit for the recovery of Atte Shanbhogi of Kinnuru and 7 other villages of Inamandi Maganni

(2). The records connected with the case received with the docket No. 456/354 dated 27th November 1894 from the Deputy Commissioner Sirsiyga District

Decision in O.S. 5065- dated 17-11-95—

Plaintiff, who was the registered Kadig of the Inamandi Maganni consisting of 89 villages, was dismissed, in 1869, for disobedience and disregard of orders, but on appeal was restored, in 1871, to the Shanbhogi of only 12 villages in the Maganni. Relying upon a Razinama executed

between him and the Govt. petitioners' father in October 1878, he filed this suit on the 5th October 1882 to recover from the Shanbogs of villages A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L of the Sorab Magani noted in the marginal list A or of the 5 villages of the Saraswathi Magani as per margin list B, but the suit was dismissed by the Assistant Commr and Deputy Commissioner. On appeal the Government reversed the decree in both the cases and remanded the case in so far as it concerned the claim to the 5 villages of Saraswathi, for fresh decision after ascertaining certain facts connected with the alleged enjoyment of the emoluments by him

A

1 Hosûr
2 Hadige
3 Yadavalli
4 Saigunasi
5 Devati Koppa
6 Hirûrali

B

1 Kummur
2 Bilagi
3 Hattigudavalliyapa
4 Hale Koppa
5 Kuppingadi
6 Hadinagi Kere
7 Bommenhalli
8 Balekoppa

with reference to the question whether the receipt by [illegible] up to the Fasli settlement in 1879, of the salary attached to the Magani Shanbhag of Saraswathi did not remove the bar by limitation in respect of the suit appertaining to the 5 villages Shanbhag of the 8 villages in question. Held

Deputy Commissioner admitted such further evidence as was adduced and found that there was no separate village Shanbhag for any of the 2 villages, that ~~petitioner's~~ appl's father and ~~2nd petitioner's~~ Respt's father, who were Hereditary Patels of Nagani Shanbhag did the duties of the village Shanbhag also, that on his demise in 1869, ~~petitioner~~ appellant ceased to get the Saslikwar and other allowance of Rs 15 claimed in addition to the monthly pay of Rs 3-8-0, that the monthly pay drawn by him upto 1873 was in the capacity of Nagani Shanbhag and that there was nothing for him to enjoy as village Shanbhag as regards the 2 villages in question. ~~The~~ Court accordingly ordered his first claim to stand and the present appeal is against this order.

2. It was urged on behalf of the ~~petitioner~~ appellant that under the orders of the Chief Commr in 1871, ~~the petitioner~~ he had

to ~~[illegible]~~ all the villages in the magani were entered to him, that he accordingly, excepting all the emoluments including the Sardesai allowance & that Revds (-7½) ~~and Comdr petitioners~~ were allowed to do duty only as his gumastas. He further contended that the Central Govt from time to time petitions submitted by him after consignment to his dismissal kept his claim alive.

3. The Government observe that only ~~that the Collector stated~~ ~~had not selected in respect~~ all the villages and that formal ~~petitioners were appointed~~ assignments ~~[illegible]~~ the Chief (com.) 25/31 Govt. no: 65 dt. 1/1/ the order dated 3/1/ the declaration to 1/1/ in her Thandi book was restricted to the 12 villages which had been allotted to the Petitioners his ~~[illegible]~~ step brother and that the allotment of the other villages to the other Sardesais was kept undisturbed. There was admittedly no formal Thandhay for any of the 3 villages in question, and by the arrangements made in 1870-71, a separate

separate Chambhay was appointed for the said village and ~~from that time~~ ever since, the petitioner had nothing to do with the Grama Chambhagi of these villages nor received any emoluments in connection with it. The enjoyment of perquisites as Magani Chambhay could not confer any right on petitioner as village Chambhay in respect of the said villages. He was ~~duly~~ dismissed, ~~and rightly held~~ excluded from this office, some 18 yrs, and the present suit to recover it filed on 3rd October 1892, is clearly barred by limitation. The appeal will, therefore, be dismissed.

10/8/95

Revenue Secretary

To The Asst Commr. Hiriyur with records.

17/11/95

+ sent by parcel.

96

Lieut Wray
Collodon
for afternoon.
Then has
come from
duty in
dem —

Dated 19-12-95.

Reg. Letter

Copy

Hon. Revenue Secretary

1895-96

No. 2654

Name of Petitioner, Nadig Shivappa and Hongakeriappa

Village, Tarnandi

Taluk, Sorab

District, Shimoga

Date of Arst, 18-1-96

Date of Receipt, 27-1-96

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosure, nil

ABSTRACT.

(Review Petition praying for a reconsideration of the decision passed in Regl Appeal No 630/1894-95

Petitioner prays that his case may be heard by a full Bench.

Ref
31/1

Bills Subd

30/1 The previous petn No 1893 was rejected for insufficiency of stamps. The present petn is stamped two Rupees.

6/2/96.

L.R. 122-91-13

The grounds for review are set forth in the petn & some also in the petn.

Submitted for orders.

H.G.
6/2/96

Subd & rec'd Rs two in full

C.
14/2/96

I do not see that there are any sufficient grounds for review

Mr Caly
21/2/96

Draft
H.G.
18/2

17/2/96

Subd & the 1st Respondent has filed the draft

H.G.
21/2/96

Draft prepd
21/2

Draft
H.G.
21/2/96

Ni formé appel par devant nous :-
Vide jugt. rec. reg. and 2654.

(1) Kait ni Rec. Sg ki pe pefendant
ware pleased in, defendant zi ki Plaintiffs
ware, ki fact ki Complaint & Summons
Degazi

(2) Kait ni Feb. Sg ki Complaint was de-
livered after Regimental Record Office
Kabul.

(3) Kait ni Feb. Sg Plaintiff ki ti-
dent was sick.

(4) Kait ni Decembr. Sg ki Plaintiff
zi ki Regiment zi Record Office
Kabul ki ~~Plaintiff~~ Plaintiff ware
- were ki Plaintiff ki ~~ki~~ ware sol-
- fered - ki Rec. No. $\frac{4238-46}{133}$ 6/6-12-87

(5) Kait ni Feb. Sg ki Appellant Court
- ki ki pleader - Degazi zi ki Regi-
- ment zi ki Defendant zi Regiment
ki Regi Kabul ki Regimental
Record Office.

(6) Kait ni Sg ki Counter Claim
kait ki Appellant Court ki pleader
Defendant zi ki Regiment ki
Ki Regi Kabul ki Regt.

(7) Kait ni Feb. Sg ki Regimental zi
ki Court.

Ni following are ki Conclusion &
Limitation.

I Ki Appeal zi Limitation zi ki Regi-
ment ki Record Office Kabul, Defendant zi
ki Regimental Order dt. 15-12-87 zi ki
6-12-87 i.e. 19 years 10 months
Plaint zi Appeal ki 5 years 10 days ki

71

Survey No. 5328-46 133

II

III

(16)

2654

27-1-96

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಕೆಪಿಎಸ್‌ಸಿ/ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆ/ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆ/೨೦೨೧-೨೨

ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಲೋಕಸೇವಾ ಆಯೋಗ

ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆ

ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಲೋಕಸೇವಾ ಆಯೋಗವು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ವಿವಿಧ ಇಲಾಖೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಖಾಲಿ ಇರುವ ಗ್ರೂಪ್ ಎ ಮತ್ತು ಗ್ರೂಪ್ ಬಿ ಹುದ್ದೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಭರ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಲು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಲೋಕಸೇವಾ ಆಯೋಗ (ಗ್ರೂಪ್ ಎ ಮತ್ತು ಗ್ರೂಪ್ ಬಿ ಹುದ್ದೆಗಳ ನೇಮಕಾತಿ) ನಿಯಮಗಳು, ೧೯೯೬ ರ ಅನ್ವಯ ಅರ್ಹ ಅಭ್ಯರ್ಥಿಗಳಿಂದ ಆನ್‌ಲೈನ್ ಮೂಲಕ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ಆಹ್ವಾನಿಸಿದೆ.

ಹುದ್ದೆಗಳ ವಿವರ, ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಹತೆ, ವಯೋಮಿತಿ, ಅರ್ಜಿ ಶುಲ್ಕ, ಆಯ್ಕೆ ವಿಧಾನ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರ ಷರತ್ತುಗಳು ಆಯೋಗದ ಅಧಿಕೃತ ವೆಬ್‌ಸೈಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಲಭ್ಯವಿವೆ. ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲು ಕೊನೆಯ ದಿನಾಂಕ ಮುಗಿದ ನಂತರ ಯಾವುದೇ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಗಣಿಸಲಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಅಭ್ಯರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಅರ್ಜಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸುವ ಮೊದಲು ಅಧಿಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಓದಿ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಅಪೂರ್ಣ ಅಥವಾ ತಪ್ಪು ಮಾಹಿತಿಯಿಂದ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ತಿರಸ್ಕರಿಸಲಾಗುವುದು.

ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿ

ఇం-రవ్వాళ్ళ
22-2-96

నంబర్
2654

(16)

L.R 122-91-14

lost her right to the Javanandi villages in 1871, & that he can have no right to the villages in Sorab on the ground of the Razinamah as no decree was passed on it, & accordingly documents & deeds & present appeal is against the decree.

So far as the claim to the Villages in Sorab is concerned, ~~appellant~~ the deed has been properly dismissed, as the Razinamah on which the claim is based cannot neither be regarded as an independent document, or as a part of the Decree of 1874 — but as regards the claim to the Parvenander villages in concerned, the Dy Cert remarks that ~~the appl~~ admittedly appellant receives the Wat pay of the Khanbhoy tree & Potagi settlement in 1879" but he does not explain why the course of action should not be reckoned in regard to the

99

Jawanadi villages for 1879 — In such case, the suit cannot be held to be barred by lapse of time. ⊗ The case will have to be remanded to the Dy Coll for record a distinct issue on the point, & if the result of the enquiry is that the suit is not barred he pass a decision on the merits of the case. ——

20/1/92

⊗ Mere [illegible] ask [illegible]

Issues be added as we do not consider ourselves to [illegible]

10/2/92

EDT.

The case has been remanded for further enquiry.

CP